

21st October 1927]

A.—A copy* of the letter from the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, No. 1924/27-C.E.P., dated 30th September 1927, with its enclosures is placed on the table.

Variations in the several estimates of the Gundlakamma project.

* 785 Q.—MR. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI: Will the hon. the Law Member and the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that Major Hasted has originally worked out the Gundlakamma project and his scheme was for a reservoir of an area of 90 to 100 square miles and to irrigate 150,000 acres;

(b) whether a later estimate in 1901 reduced the scope of the project to 35,000 acres and a net return of $6\frac{1}{2}$ per cent on the capital outlay;

(c) whether it is a fact that latterly Mr. J. P. Davidson was of opinion that 45,000 acres would be irrigated under the project by the stored water being credited with its full duty and ultimately in 1916 the estimate was reduced to 20,000 acres irrigation only and a return of only 1.35 per cent on the capital outlay;

(d) what is the cause for all these vast variations; and

(e) whether the Government will be pleased to cause the matter to be thoroughly examined?

A.—(a) Major Hasted did not work out a detailed scheme—he merely proposed the construction of a reservoir with a spread of 90 to 100 square miles to irrigate about 150,000 acres.

(b) Yes—but the net return anticipated was 4.9 per cent, not 6.5.

(c) Yes.

(d) The yield from the catchment area anticipated in the earlier stages of the project was subsequently found to be too sanguine, and the gaugings from 1912 to 1914 went to show that it would be unsafe to depend on getting more than 5,000 m.c.ft. in the reservoir.

(e) The Government have called for some further information from the Chief Engineer, and when it comes, will again consider whether it is desirable to make any further examination of the project.

Exclusion of the Gundlakamma Project scheme from the modified Kistna Reservoir project.

* 786 Q.—MR. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state with reference to paragraph 2 of the Government Order abandoning the Gundlakamma project—

(a) the reasons for not including this scheme in the modified Kistna Reservoir project in the year 1908; and

(b) whether since Government have decided in 1916 to abandon this project, the Government will consider the feasibility of including the Gundlakamma wet scheme in the Kistna Reservoir project now?

A.—(a) The modified project was designed expressly to confine the irrigable area to the country north of the Gundlakamma and

[21st October 1927]

east of the main canal because the financial prospects of the original project, including these areas worked out so unfavourably.

- (b) No. It could not possibly be included with any chance of profit.

Pulikonda (Musi) Reservoir project and gauge readings.

* 787 Q.—Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI: With reference to the answer of the hon. the Law Member to question No. 271 answered on 15th March 1927 and No. 348 answered on 17th March 1927 on the Pulikonda (Musi) Reservoir project, will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether sufficient data have been obtained of the gauge readings of the Musi river to enable the project to be put into execution in 1928 as stated in the reply to the latter question;

(b) whether it is a fact that current meter gaugings have been ordered to be stopped this year;

(c) whether the Government will be pleased to place on the table the data obtained of the current meter gaugings of the river taken in previous years; and

(d) if satisfactory readings of the current meter have been obtained in previous years, why it is still necessary to continue a river gauger at the spot this year?

A.—(a) Seventeen years' gauge readings are now available and from these and from the surface falls the supply available in each year has yet to be worked out. In answer to question No. 348 of the 17th March last, it was stated that the work would be taken up for consideration (not for execution) in 1928. The discharge calculations will be taken up for examination in 1928, after those for the Duvvaleru project now on hand are completed.

(b) Three years' current meter gaugings are available and these are considered sufficient to give an estimate of the quantity of flow for a given gauge. Hence, further gaugings have been discontinued.

(c) A statement giving the data obtained from the current meter gaugings is appended.^a

(d) Though gaugings with the current meter have been stopped as explained in (b), it is proposed to continue ordinary gauge readings (of the depth of flow) until 1928, because the larger the number of years from which calculations are made in this respect, the better.

788 Q.—Please see pages 351–353 infra.